



Handwritten signature/initials

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Chien-Chao Huang, et al.	§	Docket No.:	24061.165 (2003-1068)
Serial No.:	10/810,950	§	Customer No.	42717
Filed:	March 25, 2004	§	Art Unit:	2818
For:	Metal Gate Semiconductor	§	Examiner:	Thinh T. Nguyen
	Device and Manufacturing	§	Conf. No.:	9808
	Method	§		

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

I. Introductory Comments

The present paper is being submitted in response to the Restriction Requirement - Office Action mailed August 11, 2005.

No fees, including extension of time fees, are believed necessary for consideration of the present paper. However, if any fees, including extension of time fees are necessary, the extension of time is hereby requested, and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, including those for the extension of time, to Haynes and Boone, LLP's Deposit Account No. 08-1394.

Election of Claims is on page 2 of this paper.

Listing of Claims begins on page 3 of this paper.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 10 of this paper.

II. Election

In the Office Action mailed August 11, 2005, the Examiner alleges that the application contains claims directed to two inventions and, thus, required restriction of either:

Group I: Claims 1-32, drawn to a semiconductor device; or

Group II: Claims 33-56, drawn to a method of making a metal gate on the semiconductor.

Furthermore, in the case Applicants elect Group I, the Examiner alleges that the application contains claims directed to the following species:

Species I: claims 1-7, with all the technical features as recited in claims 1;

Species II: claims 8-14, with all the technical features as recited in claims 8;

Species III: claims 15-22, with all the technical features as recited in claim 15;

Species IV: claims 23-25, with all the technical features as recited in claim 23;

Species V: claims 26-28, with all the technical features as recited in claim 26; or

Species VI: claims 29-32, with all the technical features as recited in claim 32.

Also, in the case Applicants elect Group II, the Examiner alleges that the application contains claims directed to the following species:

Species A: claims 33-44, with all the technical features as recited in claim 33; or

Species B: claims 45-56, with all the technical features as recited in claim 45.

In response to the election of species requirement, Applicants elect Group I (Claims 1-32) and furthermore, elect Species I, corresponding to claims 1-7.